

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Potent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1490 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unite.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,162 12/15/2003		12/15/2003	Jerry Dennis Sacks	1219.04	4405
29637	7590	08/17/2006		EXAMINER	
		OUP, P.C.	BAHTA, KIDEST		
1776 YORI SUITE 550				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON	HOUSTON, TX 77056			2125	
				DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/736,162	SACKS ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Kidest Bahta	2125
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In pariod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 July</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 1.	action is non-final.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/out on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine	r election requirement.	
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 June 2006</u> is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	D⊠ accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) LInterview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	

Application/Control Number: 10/736,162 Page 2

Art Unit: 2125

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Specification (page 5, [00035]-[00036]) in view of Francis (US 6,600,418) and further in view of Isle et al. (US 4,931,950).

Regarding claim 1-9, Applicant's Specification discloses the mobile computer with the same features of the claim 1 has been available from Symbol Technologies, Inc. (see Page 6; using a mobile computer having a bar code reader, a display, an audio output device, an audio input device, a tactile input device, text-to-speech software, a voice recognition software, loader applications software, a printer and radio frequency identification (RFID) reader wherein the mobile computer is adapted for communication between an loader server system and a user and the loader server system is adapted for communication between the mobile computer and at least one external computer system).

However, The Applicant's specification doesn't specifically discloses the mobile computer been used for the purpose of object tracking and managing the transport vehicle.

Francis discloses that that display the summary of the objects to be loaded using via the text-to-speech software to audio output device (column 8, i.e., displaying on display 170 the instructions from the remote computer, display 170 includes a speaker or beeper and the input device 180 include tactile device (touch-screen) and audio (voice recognition device); RFID tag for the object 130 or bar code scanner 220; RFID tag for a transport vehicle 150. The operator receives the conformation of loading, the correct object has load and arrived at the correct loading dock or any instructions in different ways see column 3, lines 14-25, column 8, lines 29-65 reading from display 170 or an audio form. Finally, the object is product and piece of equipment pallet is a product and the machine part, which is piece of equipment.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teachings of Applicant" specification mobile computer with Francis in order to facilitates easy and essentially instant identification and confirmation of load and location. Any operator error with respect to the identity, location and movement of the load is immediately identified and corrective action may be immediately taken. The chances for errors associated with visual inspection are thus greatly reduced.

Applicant's specification and Francis fail to disclose training the voice recognition software by the user and providing instruction to the user form the loader applications

software using the text-to-speech software to the audio output device and providing information from the loader application software to the display; the answering to a series of safety questions or checks the vehicle safeness.

However, Isle discloses that training the voice recognition software by the user (column 16, lines 20-53; column 19, lines 46-55), and providing instruction to the user form the loader applications software using the text-to-speech software to the audio output device and providing information from the loader application software to the display (Abstract, column 4, lines 4-60; column 10, lines 16-29); the answering to a series of safety questions or checks the vehicle safeness (column 3, lines 39-42).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teachings of Applicant's specification with Francis and Isle in order to able to communicate with the user when the user's hands are busy and also when the user's eyes need to be focused on the task at hand rather than on a computer or video display.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2125

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed Kidest Bahta whose telephone number is 571-272-3737. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 571-272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAG system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-fee).

Kidest Bahta Primary Examiner AU 2125

8/15/06